

**PROCUREMENT GATEWAY 3 -
CONTRACT AWARD REPORT - PART I**



HARD FACILITIES MANAGEMENT SERVICES

**PCC Ref: 21602
Proactis Ref. DN610394
FTT Contract Notice: 2022/S 000-017784**

- 1. INTRODUCTION**
- 2. BACKGROUND**
- 3. PROCUREMENT PROCESS**
- 4. PRE TENDER SELECTION CRITERIA & EVALUATION**
- 5. TENDER EVALUATION CRITERIA**
- 6. SUMMARY OF EVALUATION**
- 7. FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS**
- 8. RECOMMENDATIONS**
- 9. APPROVAL**

1. INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this report is to provide a summary of the tender process for the Provision of Facilities Management Services in the Council owned buildings and to issue project team's recommendations to award nine (9) contracts derived from procurement process to the winning bidders of nine (9) Lots.

2. BACKGROUND

Plymouth City Council ("the Council") was seeking suppliers to deliver a hard Facilities Management maintenance provision, which would serve the Council owned buildings and other type of sites. The overall provision was divided to the following lots. Each lot was to be awarded a separate contract as a result of this tender.

Lot 1: General Building Repairs

Lot 2: Marine Works

Lot 3: Asbestos Analysis, Sampling & Surveying

Lot 4: Electrical Compliance

Lot 5: Electrical Reactive

Lot 6: Mechanical Compliance

Lot 7: Mechanical Reactive

Lot 8: Security & Fire Systems / Equipment Maintenance

Lot 9: Water Hygiene Compliance

Market Warming Event

Prior to the tender launch the Council organised a Supplier Event which was held on-line on 23rd June 2022. The event was attended by 103 suppliers.

3. PROCUREMENT PROCESS

A competitive procurement was carried out using the Restricted Procedure for the above EU Threshold procurements for Works contracts, as outlined in the Council's Contracts Standing Orders. This is a two-stage process comprising of a Pre-Selection stage and a Tender stage.

4. PRE TENDER SELECTION CRITERIA & EVALUATION

The tender with nine (9) Lots was launched on 29th June 2022 by publishing the contract notice: 2022/S 000-017784 and the tender pack on the Supplying the South West portal and in the Find a Tender Service. The submission deadline for a receipt of Selection Questionnaires and PAS 91's was noon on 29th July 2022.

The Council received the total of 63 on-time submissions in Stage I, with the following breakdown per each lot:

Lot 1 – 5 submissions

Lot 2 – 2 submissions

Lot 3 – 13 submissions

Lot 4 – 8 submissions

Lot 5 – 8 submissions

- Lot 6 – 6 submissions
- Lot 7 – 6 submissions
- Lot 8 – 9 submissions
- Lot 9 – 6 submissions

Each section within the Stage 1 documents: PAS 91 and Selection Questionnaire were evaluated on PASS/FAIL or on scored basis.

Pass/Fail Questions – In the event of a Tenderer being awarded a ‘FAIL’ for any question, the remainder of their bid was eliminated from the process. Also, a submission was disqualified if Pass/Fail questions were not completed.

Pass / Fail sections

- Supplier identity, key roles and contact information
- Financial information
- ESPD option, Grounds for mandatory and discretionary exclusion and non-payment of tax and social security contributions
- Health and safety policy and capability
- Optional Question Module: OI Equalities and diversity

Scored Questions – such questions were evaluated in accordance with the following weightings:

Table 1: SQ and PAS91 Scored Questions - Weightings

Questions	Weighting
Environmental management policy and capability	10%
Quality management policy and capability	10%
Experience of having carried out activities of a similar size and nature	30%
Technical facilities available to deliver contract	20%
Managerial and staff resources	20%
Business contingency planning	10%
TOTAL	100%

Scored questions were evaluated using the following Scoring Method:

Table 2: SQ and PAS91 Scoring Method

Response	Score	Definition
Excellent	5	Response is completely relevant and excellent overall. The response is comprehensive, unambiguous and demonstrates a broad depth of relevant experience and excellent level of expertise with all areas covered to a very high standard.
Very good	4	Response is very relevant and very good. The response is precisely detailed to demonstrate a very good amount of experience and expertise covering all aspects.
Good	3	Response is relevant and good. The response is sufficiently detailed to demonstrate a good amount of experience and expertise covering all aspects.
Satisfactory	2	Response is relevant and acceptable. Demonstrates a reasonable amount of experience and adequate level of expertise but lacks detail in certain areas or with some aspects missing.

Poor	1	Response is partially relevant and poor. Provides little or limited evidence of experience and competence in the required field.
Unacceptable	0	No response, an unacceptable or irrelevant response provided.

The received Selection Questionnaires and PAS91’s were first evaluated by individual evaluators in line with the scoring method, as shown in Table 2 above. These were followed by a series of moderation meetings. Further clarification of bidders’ responses were sought, where necessary.

Following an evaluation of Stage 1 submissions, the Council intended to shortlist a maximum of five (5) compliant submissions per each Lot, which achieved the highest scores in the evaluation of that Stage. Only the shortlisted submissions were invited to the Invitation to Stage 2 - Tender (ITT).

Bidders who were unsuccessful in Stage 1 and not shortlisted to Stage 2 were informed of the results and debriefed on 1st December 2022 via the Supplying the South West portal.

5. TENDER AND EVALUATION CRITERIA

In order to provide a consistent basis for assessment an Evaluation Matrix was created and approved in consultation with the evaluation panel prior to submission deadline. This tender was evaluated on basis of Most Economically Advantageous Tender (MEAT).

The table below summarises the high-level criteria that were agreed by the Project Team prior to issuing the Tender documents.

Table 3: Tender Criteria and Weightings

EVALUATION CRITERIA	WEIGHTING
Quality	50%
Finance	45%
Social Value	5%
OVERALL TOTAL	100%

In addition to the weightings, each stage of evaluation had an agreed scoring methodology in terms of the allocation of points. Table 4 below shows the methodology used to support the evaluation of Method Statement Questionnaire responses.

Table 4: Tender Evaluation Methodology

SCORE	DEFINITION	APPROACH TO SCORING
		In the evaluating panel’s reasoned opinion, the response
0	Incomplete / non-compliant	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fails to provide a response • Has very serious gaps in information; • Shows no understanding of the issues and requirements of the contract; • Misunderstands the objectives of the requirement; • Is not supported by evidence (A response at this rating is detrimental to the interests of the Council)
1	Unsatisfactory	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fails to address most of the criteria • Fails to meet the specification in most respects • Creates concerns around the practicality, resource, methodology and expertise for the proposed solution.

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is not supported by satisfactory or any evidence • Gives the Council major cause for concern. <p>(a response at this rating builds very little or no confidence that the bidder's approach/solution will deliver the requirements due to insufficient evidence or an inappropriate approach/solution)</p>
2	Poor	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Criteria is partly covered • Response is partly answered • Includes a lack of clarity, relevant information and detail in areas • Raises reservations that the solution will deliver the requirements. • Provides some evidence • Gives the Council some cause for concern <p>(a response at this rating includes reservations which cannot be easily resolved with the bidder pre-contract award (i.e. changes which would distort the competition) or during the contract term without impacting time, quality or cost.)</p>
3	Satisfactory	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provides satisfactory and relevant information • May lack substance / detail in some areas • Demonstrates a reasonable understanding of the requirements • Provides acceptable evidence • Confirms that the bidder can deliver most of the requirements <p>(a response at this rating may include minor reservations that can easily be resolved with the bidder pre-contract award (i.e. changes which would not distort the competition) or during the contract term without impacting time, quality or cost)</p>
4	Good	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provides relevant information and a good level of detail • Demonstrates a good understanding of all relevant issues; • Has a suitable, appropriate, and fully worked-up methodological approach. • Offers a good standard of evidence to support the response • Produces confidence in the bidder's ability to deliver a suitable solution, on time and at an appropriate cost. <p>(A response at this rating may include minor reservations that can easily be resolved with the bidder pre-contract award [i.e. changes which would not distort the competition] or during the contract term without impacting time, quality or cost)</p>
5	Excellent	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provides full and appropriate information and level of detail; • Shows a full and comprehensive understanding of all relevant issues; • Has a suitable, appropriate, and fully worked-up methodological approach , together with full evidence of how that approach would be applied in practice; • Indicates that the bidder may add value to the requirement • Provides a high standard of evidence to support the response • Creates full confidence that the requirement will be delivered in full <p>(an excellent response should not include any reservations, doubt or uncertainty)</p>

Quality (50%) – All Lots

All criteria and questions in the Method Statement had weightings attached to them to reflect their relative importance, as demonstrated in table 5 below. This information was provided to bidders as part of instructions in the ITT pack.

Table 5: Tender Criteria and Weightings applicable to all lots

No.	Question / Evaluation Area	Weighting 50%
1	LOT SELECTION	not scored
2	ACCREDITATIONS AND CERTIFICATIONS	PASS/FAIL
3	MANAGEMENT OF THE SERVICE	15
4	PRIORITY RESPONSES	20
5	SUBCONTRACTING AND WORKING WITH OTHERS	20
6	MANAGING SUPPLY CHAINS	10
7	QUALITY MANAGEMENT	20
8	RISKS AND CHALLENGES	15
QUALITY TOTAL		100

The sum of awarded points will then be converted into the 50% available for Quality as follows:

$$\frac{\text{Points Scored}}{\text{Maximum Points Available}} \times 50\% \times 100$$

Minimum thresholds for Quality

In addition, the Council reserved the right to disqualify any organisation which:

- did not achieve a minimum 50% out of available 100% in each of the quality criteria listed in Table 6 above, and
- achieved the score of 0 or 1 in any question of the Method Statement

The quality aspects of the bids were first evaluated by individual evaluators in line with the scoring method, as shown in Table 4 above. These were followed by a series of moderation meetings. Further clarification of bidders' responses were sought, where necessary. Subsequently scores were moderated further based on the clarifications.

Finance Evaluation (45%) – All Lots

The Finance evaluation documents, were drafted by a Quantity Surveyor who together with Procurement were also responsible for analysis and assessment of Finance/Price element of the tenders. The Finance methodology was based on the lowest price in accordance with the evaluation strategy in the ITT document pack. A submission with the lowest Evaluated Tender Price were awarded a maximum weighting.

Price criterion for each Lot contained two (2) sections, which were evaluated on the following basis:

Table 6: Finance criteria and weightings

Price Section	Weighting (45%)
Rates	60
Mark Ups	40
Total	100

Section 1 – Rates (60 out of 100)

Sum of prices of all Rates elements listed in the schedule for the relevant Lot formed the Evaluated Total Price for Section 1.

Evaluated Total Price for Section 1 in each submission was scored on the bases of the lowest price. The scoring was determined using the following formula:

$$\frac{\text{Lowest Total Rates Price}}{\text{Evaluated Rates Price}} \times 60\% \times 100$$

Section 2 – Mark Ups (40 out of 100)

Sum of percentages of all Mark Up elements listed in the schedule for the relevant Lot formed the Evaluated Total Mark Up for Section 2.

Evaluated Total Mark Up for Section 2 in each submission was scored on the bases of the lowest percentage. The scoring was determined using the following formula:

$$\frac{\text{Lowest Mark Ups}}{\text{Evaluated Mark Ups}} \times 40\% \times 100$$

Final Evaluated Tender Price (45%)

The sum of achieved weightings for Section 1 – Rates and Section 2 – Mark Ups formed the Final Evaluated Tender Price. The final scoring was determined using the following formula:

$$\frac{\text{Highest Sum of Sections 1 and 2}}{\text{2nd Highest Sum}} \times 45\% \times 100$$

Social Value Evaluation (5%) – All Lots

Bidders were required to complete columns K and N in the Social Value – TOM Procurement Calculator. Social value commitments were assessed based on a combination of quantitative and qualitative assessment, as indicated in Table 7 below:

Table 7: Social Value criteria and weightings

Social Value Evaluation	Evaluation Basis	Available 5%
Qualitative elements	Response to column N	50
Quantitative elements	Sum of commitment – column K	50
Total		100

Qualitative elements were assessed by evaluators from the FM Team and a subsequent moderation of scores. The Quantitative elements were assessed by Procurement.

The sum of awarded marks for quantitative and qualitative SV elements were converted into 5% available for Social Value as follows:

$$\frac{\text{Total Weighting Acheived}}{100} \times 5\% \times 100$$

6. SUMMARY OF EVALUATION

Invitations to Tender were issued to Bidders who were successful in Stage 1 on 1st December 2022 via the Supplying the South West portal. Bidders were allowed a period for asking clarification questions, which along with the answers were circulated amongst all of the bidders. Tenders were opened on 17th January 2023.

In order to ensure fairness of the process the evaluation of Quality and Social Value were conducted separate from with Price assessment. Price information being held back from the Quality evaluators.

Tender Submissions

The Council received the following number of on-time tender responses per each lot::

- Lot 1 – 3 submissions
- Lot 2 – 2 submissions
- Lot 3 – 4 submissions
- Lot 4 – 3 submissions
- Lot 5 – 4 submissions
- Lot 6 – 4 submissions
- Lot 7 – 3 submissions
- Lot 8 – 4 submissions
- Lot 9 – 3 submissions

Quality

The tenders in each lot were evaluated by the evaluation panel all of whom had the appropriate skills and experience in order to ensure transparency and robustness in the process. The resulting scores are contained in the confidential paper.

Social Value

The tenders in each lot were evaluated by the evaluation panel all of whom had the appropriate skills and experience in order to ensure transparency and robustness in the process. The resulting scores are contained in the confidential paper

7. FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

Price / Finance criterion in each lot was evaluated by Procurement and a Quantity Surveyor.

Financial provision for contracts deriving from each tendered lot has been made within the project budget. The maximum spends for each contract related to this decision are listed below:

- Lot 1: General Building Repairs – £ 15,410,000
- Lot 2: Marine Works – £7,450,000
- Lot 3: Asbestos Analysis, Sampling & Surveying – £310,000
- Lot 4: Electrical Compliance – £775,000
- Lot 5: Electrical Reactive – £8,500,000
- Lot 6: Mechanical Compliance – £590,000

Lot 7: Mechanical Reactive – £9,100,000

Lot 8: Security & Fire Systems / Equipment Maintenance – £2,365,000

Lot 9: Water Hygiene Compliance – £660,000

The actual spend per each individual contract will depend upon the uptake throughout the life of each contract. Details of the finance/price evaluation and contractual pricing are contained in the confidential paper.

8. RECOMMENDATIONS

It is recommended to conditionally award the following contracts to Bidders who submitted the Most Economically Advantageous Tenders for the respected lot:

Lot 1: General Building Repairs – JNE Construction Ltd.

Lot 2: Marine Works – JNE Construction Ltd.

Lot 3: Asbestos Analysis, Sampling & Surveying – Tersus Consultancy Ltd.

Lot 4: Electrical Compliance – Dodd Group (Midlands) Ltd.

Lot 5: Electrical Reactive – KK Controls & Equipment Ltd.

Lot 6: Mechanical Compliance – Dodd Group (Midlands) Ltd.

Lot 7: Mechanical Reactive – Dodd Group (Midlands) Ltd.

Lot 8: Security & Fire Systems / Equipment Maintenance – Scutum South West Ltd.

Lot 9: Water Hygiene Compliance – Churchill Contract Services Ltd.

Details of the successful Tenderers have been set out in the confidential paper. This award will be provisional and subject to the receipt of the satisfactory self-certification documents detailed in PAS91 and Selection Questionnaire from the winning Tenderers.

In the event the highest scoring supplier cannot provide the necessary documentation the Council reserves the right to award the contract to the second highest scoring supplier.

This award is also subject to the outcome of any challenge made during the call-in or mandatory standstill period.



9. APPROVAL

Authorisation of Contract Award Report

Author (Responsible Officer / Project Lead)

Name: Gosia Anthony

Job Title: Category Lead

Additional Comments (Optional):	This document has been drafted based on the Evaluation Panels' assessments and recommendations.		
Signature:		Date:	12/06/23
Head of Service / Service Director [Signature provides authorisation to this award report and award of Contract]			
Name:	Giles Perritt		
Job Title:	Assistant Chief Executive		
Additional Comments (Optional):			
Signature:		Date:	20 June 2023